

**REMARKS**

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-12 are pending.

Claims 1-4 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Muranaga (US Patent No. 5,671,428).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muranaga in view of Light (US Patent No. 5,973,693).

Claims 1-4 and 6-12 are amended, and, thus, claim 1-12 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this Amendment. The foregoing rejections are hereby traversed.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS**

The independent claims 1, 2 and 6-10 are amended to further emphasize the patentably distinguishing features of the present invention over Muranaga. An interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor was conducted on April 20, 2004, in which based upon the Interview Summary the proposed claim amendments appeared to overcome Muranaga.

Muranaga, in column 12, lines 16-20, discloses: "a document written by a author is commented by a commentator, and the document is then modified by the author according to the comment given by the commentator, and the modified document is then checked by a proof-reader." The purpose of Muranaga is realizing smooth and efficient collaborative document processing work among the collaborating authors.

In contrast to Muranaga, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 2 and 6-7, using the recitation of independent claim 1 as an example, provides:

1. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A document review apparatus comprising:

a communication unit connected to a network and performing communication with other devices;

a memory unit which stores a reviewed form, a review request form, response forms, and a demand form, each response form including a portion used as a model for writing a review result, the portion including stipulations related to the reviewed form;

a determination unit which determines, based on information received from said communication unit in response to the review request form, whether the information is the response forms as critiques with critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of the reviewed form critiqued by reviewers;

a storing control unit storing the response form critiques, as collected critiques in said memory unit; and

a creating unit generating a single critique analysis based on the collected critiques when a predetermined number of the response form critiques have been stored in said memory unit,

wherein the communication unit transmits a demand email when one of the response forms is not received at a specified timeout in response to the review request form, and

wherein the creating unit generating of the single critique analysis comprises processing, based upon the received response form critiques, each target phrase in the reviewed form, and when a conflict between a target phrase and the stipulations in the response form critiques is indicated by the reviewers as a correction and/or a suggested change, skipping a calculation of an agreement rate and calculating evaluations regarding the correction and/or the suggested change in the target phrase (amended independent claim 1, emphasis added).

The present claimed invention patentably distinguishes from Muranaga as follows:

First, in contrast to Muranaga and the Examiner's assertion in pages 3 and 5 of the Office Action, the present claimed invention recites: "the response forms as critiques with critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of the reviewed form critiqued by reviewers," which clearly differs from Muranaga's votes and differs from Muranaga's comments, because Muranaga does not analyze the comments, but only

stores the comments (column 12, lines 16-20). In particular, in Muranaga, the author modifies the document based upon the comments (column 12, lines 16-20). In contrast to Muranaga's stored comments for reference by the author, the present claimed invention provides, "generating a single critique analysis based on the collected critiques when a predetermined number of the response form critiques have been stored in said memory unit," each critique having "critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of the reviewed form critiqued by reviewers." Therefore, Muranaga cannot generate the present claimed invention's "single critique analysis based on the collected critiques."

Second, because Muranaga does not perform any comment analysis, Muranaga cannot anticipate the present claimed invention's "updates the contents of the reviewed form stored in said first memory unit by using the statistical data created by said creating unit," as recited in independent claims 2, 7, 9 and 10 of the present Application.

Third, Muranaga fails to disclose or suggest the present claimed invention's,

a reviewed form, a review request form, response forms,  
and a demand form, each response form including a portion used  
as a model for writing a review result, the portion including  
stipulations related to the reviewed form; ... (amended claim 1).

In particular, in contrast to Muranaga the present claimed invention provides a "response form including a portion used as a model for writing a review result, the portion including stipulations related to the reviewed form." Support can be found, for example, in page 11, lines 3-8, 21-25, page 15, line 9 to page 16, line 2, and FIG. 4 (bottom portion of the review response form) and FIG. 9, of the present Application. In other words, Muranaga's votes and/or FIG. 30 propositions, do not disclose or suggest the present claimed invention's, "each response form including a portion used as a model for writing a review result, the portion including stipulations related to the reviewed form."

Fourth, in contrast to Muranaga, the present claimed invention provides, "transmits a demand email when one of the response forms is not received at a specified timeout in response to the review request form" (amended claim 1). Support can be found, for example, on page 18, lines 7-24 of the present Application.

Fifth, in contrast to Muranaga, the present claimed invention provides conflict checking a reviewed content against related stipulations of the content by reviewers, as follows:

wherein the creating unit generating of the single critique analysis comprises processing, based upon the received response form critiques, each target phrase in the reviewed form, and when a conflict between a target phrase and the stipulations in the response form critiques is indicated by the reviewers as a correction and/or a suggested change, skipping a calculation of an agreement rate and calculating evaluations regarding the correction and/or the suggested change in the target phrase (amended claim 1).

In particular, Muranaga does not disclose or suggest the present claimed invention's "when a conflict between a target phrase and the stipulations in the response form critiques is indicated by the reviewers as a correction and/or a suggested change, skipping a calculation of an agreement rate and calculating evaluations regarding the correction and/or the suggested change in the target phrase." A benefit of such "skipping a calculation of an agreement rate" is that once there is a conflict indicated by a reviewer between a target phrase in the reviewed form and a related stipulation, it is more advantageous to confirm the conflict rather than calculate an agreement rate of changes proposed by reviewers on the conflicting target phrases. Support can be found, for example, on page 19, line 20 to page 20, line 17 and page 24, line 23 to page 26, line 2, and FIG. 12, of the present Application.

Sixth, although in page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that "unit ID" serves as a phrase number, Muranaga's column 27, lines 7-29 and FIGS. 36A to 36C, disclose that a "unit ID" represents a set of text data in a data unit. As shown in FIGS. 36A to 36C of Muranaga, a data unit contains a plurality of phrases. Further, Muragana's FIG. 30 and column 17, line 26 to column 26, line 24, which is relied upon by the Examiner in page 3 of the Office Action, disclose a proposition and a "unit ID," however, again, Muragana's "unit ID" differs from the present claimed invention's "each target phrase in the reviewed form" shown in FIG. 6 of the present Application that is used for critiquing by the reviewers. Therefore, Muranaga's "unit ID" cannot correspond to the present claimed invention's:

wherein the creating unit generating of the single critique analysis comprises processing, based upon the received response form critiques, each target phrase in the reviewed form, and when a conflict between a target phrase and the stipulations in the response form critiques is indicated by the reviewers as a correction and/or a suggested change, skipping a calculation of an agreement rate and calculating evaluations regarding the correction and/or the suggested change in the target phrase (amended claim 1, emphasis added).

Also FIG. 6 of the present Application shows a "reviewed form" with "each target phrase in the reviewed form" and phrase numbers of the target phrases (dependent claim 12) in the reviewed form, and "stipulations related to the reviewed form" under the relevant standards section heading of FIG. 6.


Therefore, it is submitted that in view of the claim amendments, the remarks, and the interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor conducted on April 20, 2004, Muranaga does not anticipate the claims as amended, and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-12 and allowance of claim 1-12 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 30, 2004

By:   
Mehdi Sheikerz  
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501